

Structure of the module of vector-valued modular forms

Christopher Marks*

Geoffrey Mason†

University of California at Santa Cruz

Abstract

Let V be a representation of the modular group Γ of dimension p . We show that the $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded space $\mathcal{H}(V)$ of holomorphic vector-valued modular forms associated to V is a free module of rank p over the algebra $\mathcal{M}$ of classical holomorphic modular forms. We study the nature of $\mathcal{H}$ considered as a functor from Γ -modules to graded $\mathcal{M}$ -lattices and give some applications, including the calculation of the Hilbert-Poincaré of $\mathcal{H}(V)$ in some cases.

MSC 11F99, 13C05

1 Introduction

Vector-valued modular forms have been a part of number theory for some time, but a systematic development of their properties has begun only relatively recently ([BG1], [KM1]-[KM3], [M1], [M2]). One motivation for this comes from rational and logarithmic field theories, where vector-valued modular forms arise naturally ([ES], [DLM], [My], [Z]). Modular forms on noncongruence subgroups are a special case of vector-valued modular forms, and one of the goals of both this case and the general theory is to find arithmetic conditions which characterize *classical* modular forms (i.e. on a congruence subgroup) among all vector-valued modular forms (cf. [KoM], [KL]). A systematic approach to this problem requires detailed information about the general structure of the space of vector-valued modular forms attached to a representation of the modular group. The purpose of this paper is to provide such information. The main theorems extend some of the results of [M2], dealing with 2-dimensional irreducible representations, to a general context. In the next few paragraphs we give some basic definitions sufficient to state our main results. A fuller discussion of background material can be found in [M2] and in Section 2 below.

*Supported by NSA

†Supported by NSA and NSF

Let $\Gamma = SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, acting on the complex upper half-plane $\mathcal{H}$ in the usual way, and with standard generators

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let V be a left $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$ -module of finite dimension p . We denote the action of $\gamma \in \Gamma$ on $v \in V$ by γv or $\gamma.v$. Let

$$\mathfrak{F} = \{\text{holomorphic } F : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow V\}.$$

For an integer k there is a right action $\mathfrak{F} \times \Gamma \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}$ given by

$$\gamma : F(\tau) \mapsto \gamma^{-1}.F|_k\gamma(\tau), \quad (1)$$

where $|_k$ is the usual stroke operator familiar from the classical theory of modular forms. A *weak* vector-valued modular form of weight k is a Γ -invariant of the action (1).

There is a basic subdivision of the general theory according to whether or not the restriction of V to the T -matrix is unitary. If this is the case, we say that V is *T-unitarizable*. We will always assume throughout the present paper that V is indeed *T-unitarizable*. Then V has a basis which furnishes a representation $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow GL(p, \mathbb{C})$ with

$$\rho(T) = \text{diag}(e^{2\pi i m_1}, \dots, e^{2\pi i m_p}) \quad (2)$$

and $0 \leq m_j < 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq p$. A weak modular form is then a column vector of holomorphic *component functions*¹ $F(\tau) = (f_1(\tau), \dots, f_p(\tau))^t$ satisfying

$$\rho(\gamma)F(\tau) = (f_1|_k\gamma(\tau), \dots, f_p|_k\gamma(\tau))^t, \quad \gamma \in \Gamma. \quad (3)$$

By a standard argument, (3) implies that each component function has a q -expansion

$$f_j(\tau) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{jn} q^{\lambda_j + n} \quad (4)$$

such that $\lambda_j - m_j$ is a nonnegative integer. We call $F(\tau)$ a (holomorphic) *vector-valued modular form of weight k* (with respect to V , or ρ) in case $a_{jn} = 0$ for $n < 0$ and $1 \leq j \leq p$. This condition is independent of the choice of basis of V .

Let $\mathcal{H}(k, V)$ be the set of all vector-valued modular forms of weight k with respect to V . It is a finite-dimensional linear space which reduces to 0 for $k \ll 0$. (See [KM1], [KM2], [M1] for further discussion.) In the further development of the theory it is no loss to assume that $\rho(S^2) = \pm I_p$ (cf. [KM1]). With this assumption, the direct sum of the spaces $\mathcal{H}(k, V)$ takes the form

$$\mathcal{H}(V) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{H}(k_0 + 2k, V) \quad (5)$$

¹superscript t denotes *transpose* of a vector

for a certain minimal weight k_0 .

Let $\mathcal{M} = \oplus_k \mathcal{M}_{2k}$ be the space of (classical holomorphic) modular forms on Γ , regarded as a $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded, weighted polynomial algebra. Pointwise multiplication by elements of $\mathcal{M}$ turns $\mathcal{H}(V)$ into a $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded $\mathcal{M}$ -module. We can now state our main results, which concern the structure of $\mathcal{H}(V)$ considered as $\mathcal{M}$ -module. We emphasize that throughout the paper we assume that V is T -unitarizable of dimension p with $\rho(S^2) = \pm I_p$. The basic result is

Theorem 1 $\mathcal{H}(V)$ is a free $\mathcal{M}$ -module of rank p .

We may therefore consider $\mathcal{H}$ as a *covariant functor*

$$\mathcal{H} : \Gamma\text{-Mod}_{fin} \rightarrow \text{Gr}\mathcal{M}\text{-Latt}$$

from the category of finite-dimensional $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$ -modules to the category of $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded $\mathcal{M}$ -lattices (an $\mathcal{M}$ -lattice is a finitely generated projective (= free) $\mathcal{M}$ -module). The next Theorem gives some of the main properties of this functor.

Theorem 2 Suppose that $0 \rightarrow U \xrightarrow{i} V \xrightarrow{j} W \rightarrow 0$ is a short exact sequence of $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$ -modules. Then the following hold.

(a) $\mathcal{H}$ is faithful and left exact, in particular there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(U) \xrightarrow{i_*} \mathcal{H}(V) \xrightarrow{j_*} \mathcal{H}(W).$$

(b) $\mathcal{H}$ is *pure* in the sense that $i_*\mathcal{H}(U)$ is an $\mathcal{M}$ -direct summand of $\mathcal{H}(V)$.

(c) $j_*\mathcal{H}(V)$ is a free $\mathcal{M}$ -module of rank $\dim W = \dim V - \dim U$ and it has *finite codimension* in $\mathcal{H}(W)$.

Let $D : \mathcal{M}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{k+2}$ be the usual graded derivation of $\mathcal{M}$ defined via

$$D(f) = \theta f + kPf, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_{2k}, \quad (6)$$

where $\theta = qd/dq = (2\pi i)^{-1}d/d\tau$ and

$$P = E_2(\tau) = -1/12 + \sum_{n \geq 1} \sigma_1(n)q^n.$$

The algebra $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{M}[d]$ of skew polynomials in d with coefficients in $\mathcal{M}$ consists of (noncommutative) polynomials $\sum_{j=0}^n f_j d^j$, $f_j \in \mathcal{M}$, with the usual addition and multiplication subject to the identity

$$df - fd = D(f).$$

The action of $\mathcal{M}$ on $\mathcal{H}(V)$ extends to an action of $\mathcal{R}$, so that $\mathcal{H}(V)$ is a graded $\mathcal{R}$ -module. See [M1], [M2] for further details. Although this $\mathcal{R}$ -module structure is not explicit in the statements of Theorems 1 and 2, it plays an important rôle in the proofs.

One of the main steps in the proof of Theorem 1 is to establish that $\mathcal{H}(V)$ is *finitely generated* as $\mathcal{M}$ -module. The theory of vector-valued Poincaré series [KM1] implies the existence $F \in \mathcal{H}(k, V)$ such that the component functions of F are linearly independent, and together with the theory of differential

equations implies that $\mathcal{R}F$ contains a free graded $\mathcal{M}$ -submodule $\mathcal{H}'$ of rank p such that $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{H}'$ has bounded degree. Methods of commutative algebra then imply finite generation. Freeness is established by showing that $\mathcal{H}(V)$ is Cohen-Macaulay, which turns out to be very natural in the present context.

Theorem 1 implies that there are p distinguished integers $e_1, \dots, e_p$, namely the weights of a set of p vector-valued modular forms $F_1, \dots, F_p$ which are free generators of $\mathcal{H}(V)$ as $\mathcal{M}$ -module, that are *uniquely determined* by V . We call these the *fundamental weights* associated to V . In terms of the Hilbert-Poincaré series

$$PS \mathcal{H}(V) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \dim \mathcal{H}(k_0 + 2k) t^{k_0 + 2k}$$

we have

$$PS \mathcal{H}(V) = \frac{t^{e_1} + \dots + t^{e_p}}{(1 - t^4)(1 - t^6)}. \quad (7)$$

Exactly how the fundamental weights are determined by V remains somewhat mysterious. To some extent, this is related to the fact that $\mathcal{H}$ is *not* an exact functor (cf. Theorem 4 below). Nevertheless, we can use the fundamental weights to impose a $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading on V , say by choosing a basis v_i and giving v_i weight e_i . Then the functor $\mathcal{H}$ corresponds to an extension of scalars

$$V \mapsto \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V$$

where $\mathcal{M} \otimes V$ inherits the tensor product grading.

We prove two further results, based on Theorems 1 and 2, that illustrate aspects of the general theory. The first is concerned with the case that $\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{R}F$ is a *cyclic* $\mathcal{R}$ -module. This condition necessarily holds in a number of cases when V is an *irreducible* $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$ -module of small dimension, including all irreducible V with $\dim V \leq 3$. (See [M2] and [Ma] for further details.) We establish

Theorem 3 If $\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{R}F$ is a *cyclic* $\mathcal{R}$ -module with generator F of weight k_0 , then the component functions of F form a fundamental system of solutions of a *modular linear differential equation* (MLDE)

$$L_{k_0}[f] = 0 \quad (8)$$

of weight k_0 and order p . The roots of the indicial equation are the exponents m_j in (2), they are *distinct*, and the minimal weight k_0 satisfies

$$12 \sum_{j=1}^p m_j = p(p + k_0 - 1). \quad (9)$$

Conversely, if the indicial equation of the MLDE (8) has real, distinct roots m_j that lie between 0 and 1 and satisfy (9), then a fundamental system of solutions spans a Γ -module V and are the components of a vector-valued modular form

F for which $\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{R}F$. (For further information concerning MLDE's in this context, see [M1], [M2].)

In this case we can take the free generators to be $F, DF, \dots, D^{p-1}F$, whence the fundamental weights are $k_0, k_0 + 2, \dots, k_0 + 2p - 2$, and

$$PS \mathcal{H}(V) = \frac{t^{k_0}(1 - t^{2p})}{(1 - t^2)(1 - t^4)(1 - t^6)}.$$

We complete the paper by discussing the case of *indecomposable* 2-dimensional representations of Γ . The irreducible case is handled in [M2] (alternatively, by Theorem 3). The case when V is indecomposable but *not* irreducible is less straightforward, and illustrates some of the subtleties involved in calculating the Hilbert-Poincaré series in general.

To state our result, recall that the group of characters of Γ is cyclic of order 12, generated by a character χ uniquely determined by the equality $\chi(T) = e^{2\pi i/12}$.

Theorem 4 Suppose that V is a 2-dimensional indecomposable Γ -module occurring in the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \chi^a \xrightarrow{i} V \xrightarrow{j} \chi^b \rightarrow 0$$

($0 \leq a, b \leq 11$, $|a - b| = 2$) furnishing a representation ρ which is *upper triangular*. One of the following holds:

(a) There is a (split) short exact sequence of graded $\mathcal{M}$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\chi^a) \xrightarrow{i_*} \mathcal{H}(V) \xrightarrow{j_*} \mathcal{H}(\chi^b) \rightarrow 0,$$

(b) $(a, b) = (10, 0)$ or $(11, 1)$ and there is an exact sequence of graded $\mathcal{M}$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\chi^a) \xrightarrow{i_*} \mathcal{H}(V) \xrightarrow{j_*} \mathcal{H}(\chi^b) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_b \rightarrow 0$$

($\mathbb{C}_b$ is the 1-dimensional graded $\mathcal{M}$ -module in weight b).

In particular, part (b) confirms our earlier assertion that $\mathcal{H}$ is generally not right exact. Note that the condition $|a - b| = 2$ in Theorem 4 *necessarily* holds whenever V is indecomposable but not irreducible. See Section 3 of [M2] and Section 4 below for further details.

Terry Gannon has recently informed the authors that he and Peter Bantay have also found a proof of Theorem 1 [BG2]. Their methods, as in [BG1], are rather different to ours, and will appear elsewhere.

2 Preliminaries

We keep the assumptions and notation of Section 1. The algebra of classical modular forms on Γ is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded algebra

$$\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_{2k}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{2k}$ is the space of holomorphic modular forms of weight $2k$. There is an isomorphism of $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded algebras

$$\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{C}[Q, R]$$

where $\mathbb{C}[Q, R]$ is a weighted polynomial algebra with generators

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= E_4(\tau) = 1 + 240 \sum_{n \geq 1} \sigma_3(n) q^n, \\ R &= E_6(\tau) = 1 - 504 \sum_{n \geq 1} \sigma_5(n) q^n, \end{aligned}$$

the usual Eisenstein series of weights 4 and 6 respectively. The first two Lemmas below are consequences of the theory of vector-valued Poincaré series [KM1] and play an important rôle in the proofs of the main Theorems.

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose that $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p$ is a sequence of nonnegative integers and $(c_1, \dots, c_p)$ a sequence of scalars. Then for all large enough k , there is $F(\tau) = (f_1(\tau), \dots, f_p(\tau))^t \in \mathcal{H}(k_0 + 2k, V)$ such that*

$$f_r(\tau) = c_r q^{\mu_r + m_r} + \dots, \quad 1 \leq r \leq p.$$

Proof: Choose r in the range $1 \leq r \leq p$ and an integer $\nu_r < 0$. By Theorem 3.2 of [KM1] we can find, for large enough k , a (meromorphic) vector-valued modular form $P_r(\tau)$ of weight k such that the component functions $P_{r,j}(\tau)$ are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{r,r}(\tau) &= q^{\nu_r + m_r} + \dots \\ P_{r,j}(\tau) &= q^{n_{r,j} + m_j} + \dots, \quad n_{r,j} > \mu_j, \quad j \neq r. \end{aligned}$$

We may, and shall, arrange that the $P_r(\tau)$ have a *common weight* k for large enough k . Then $P(\tau) = \sum_r c_r P_r(\tau)$ is a meromorphic vector-valued modular form of weight k . Now choose $\nu_r = \mu_r - d$ for some integer d . The vector-valued modular form

$$F(\tau) = \Delta^d(\tau) P(\tau).$$

has the required properties, and the Lemma follows. $\square$

We say that the vector-valued modular form $F(\tau)$ is *essential* if $F(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq V$ spans V . Choose a basis of V and write $F(\tau)$ in component form, say

$$F(\tau) = (f_1(\tau), \dots, f_p(\tau))^t.$$

Then $F(\tau)$ is essential if, and only if, $f_1(\tau), \dots, f_p(\tau)$ are linearly independent functions. If, in Lemma 2.1, we choose the μ_r to be *distinct*, the resulting vector-valued modular form $F(\tau)$ has component functions which are clearly linearly independent. Hence, we obtain

Lemma 2.2 $\mathcal{H}(V)$ contains an essential vector-valued modular form. $\square$

Lemma 2.3 *There is a constant A depending only on V such that*

$$\left| \dim \mathcal{H}(k_0 + 2k, V) - \frac{pk}{6} \right| < A \quad (10)$$

for all $k \geq k_0$ with $k-k_0$ even.

Proof: This too follows from the theory of Poincaré series. Indeed, it is a consequence of Theorems 2.5 and 4.2 of [KM1]. The result may also be deduced from Lemma 2.2 using the theory of MLDEs as in [M1]. $\square$

Suppose that $\alpha : V \rightarrow W$ is a morphism of Γ -modules. The commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & W \\ & \nwarrow \quad \nearrow & \\ & \mathfrak{H} & \end{array}$$

allows us to push-forward holomorphic maps $F : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow V$ to get holomorphic maps $\alpha \circ F : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow W$.

Lemma 2.4 *The following hold:*

(a) α induces a map

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_* : \mathcal{H}(k, V) &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}(k, W) \\ F &\mapsto \alpha \circ F. \end{aligned}$$

(b) If $V \xrightarrow{\alpha} W \xrightarrow{\beta} X$ are morphisms of Γ -modules, then $(\beta \circ \alpha)_* = \beta_* \circ \alpha_*$.

Proof: Suppose that $F(\tau) \in \mathcal{H}(k, V)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\gamma^{-1} \cdot \alpha_*(F)|_k \gamma(\tau) = \gamma^{-1} \cdot (\alpha \circ F)|_k \gamma(\tau) \\ &= \alpha \gamma^{-1} \cdot (F|_k \gamma(\tau)) \\ &= \alpha \circ F(\tau) = \alpha_*(F)(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\alpha_*(F) \in \mathcal{H}(k, W)$, and part (a) follows. Part (b) is clear. $\square$

From Lemma 2.4 it follows that there is a covariant functor

$$\mathcal{H} : \Gamma\text{-Mod}_{fin} \rightarrow Gr\mathcal{M}\text{-Mod}$$

from the category of finite-dimensional Γ -modules to the category of $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded $\mathcal{M}$ -modules.

Lemma 2.5 *The functor $\mathcal{H}$ is faithful and left exact.*

Proof: To prove that $\mathcal{H}$ is faithful, we must show that if $\alpha : V \rightarrow W$ is a nonzero morphism of Γ -modules then $\mathcal{H}(\alpha) = \alpha_*$ is also nonzero. By Lemma 2.2 there is an integer k such that $\mathcal{H}(k, V)$ contains an essential vector-valued modular form, say $F(\tau)$. Then $F(\tau)$ generates V as linear space, so if $\alpha \neq 0$ then also $\alpha_*(F) = \alpha \circ F \neq 0$. Thus α_* is itself nonzero, as required.

As for left exactness, we have to show that if

$$0 \rightarrow U \xrightarrow{\alpha} V \xrightarrow{\beta} W$$

is exact, then so too is

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(U) \xrightarrow{\alpha_*} \mathcal{H}(V) \xrightarrow{\beta_*} \mathcal{H}(W). \quad (11)$$

This is standard, and we omit the proof. $\square$

By a d -ideal in $\mathcal{M}$ we mean a left $\mathcal{R}$ -submodule of $\mathcal{M}$ regarded as $\mathcal{R}$ -module. In other words, an ideal in $\mathcal{M}$ invariant under D .

Lemma 2.6 *Let $I \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ be a nonzero, graded d -ideal. Suppose that*

$$\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{M}/I}(\Delta) = 0. \quad (12)$$

Then $I = \mathcal{M}$.

Proof: Since I is graded it is the direct sum of its subspaces $I_{2k} = I \cap \mathcal{M}_{2k}$. Let $m \in I_{2k}$ be a *nonzero* element of least weight in I , and consider the linear span N of the two elements $QD(m), Rm \in I_{2k+6}$. If $\dim N = 2$ then it contains a nonzero cuspform α . Then $\alpha = \Delta\beta \in I$ with $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_{2k-6}$, and by (12) we have $\beta \in I$. This contradicts the minimality of $2k$, and shows that $QD(m)$ and Rm are scalar multiples of one another. Set

$$m = \sum c_{uv} Q^u R^v$$

where c_{uv} is a scalar and (u, v) range over pairs satisfying $2k = 4u + 6v$. Then we must have

$$\begin{aligned} QD(m) &= \sum c_{uv} (uQ^u R^{v+1} + vQ^{u+3} R^{v-1}) \\ &= c \sum c_{uv} Q^u R^{v+1} \end{aligned}$$

for a nonzero constant c . If u_0 is the highest power of Q occurring with nonzero coefficient in the expression for m , we see that the corresponding v is zero, and we have

$$c = u_0.$$

Then looking at the *lowest* power of Q that occurs with nonzero coefficient, say u_1 , we obtain

$$cc_{u_1 v_1} = u_0 c_{u_1 v_1} = c_{u_1 v_1} u_1.$$

We conclude that $u_0 = u_1$, i.e. $m = cQ^c$. Then $D(m) = c^2 Q^{c-1} R$ and I contains

$$3RD(m) - 2cQ^2 m = c^2 Q^{c-1} (3R^2 - 2Q^3) = c^2 Q^{c-1} \Delta.$$

If $c \geq 1$, (12) tells us that $Q^{c-1} \in I_{2k-4}$, contradiction. So $c = 0$ and therefore I contains a nonzero constant. The Lemma follows immediately. $\square$

We let $\mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{M}\Delta$ be the principal prime ideal in $\mathcal{M}$ generated by Δ .

Lemma 2.7 *Suppose that $I \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is a nonzero d -ideal. Then $I \supseteq \mathfrak{p}^r$ for some integer $r \geq 0$.*

Proof: Let

$$J = \{x \in \mathcal{M} \mid \Delta^n x \in I, n \geq 0\}.$$

J/I is the Δ -torsion submodule of $\mathcal{M}/I$. If $\Delta^m \in J$ for some $m \geq 0$ then the Lemma holds. So we may, and shall, assume that this is *not* the case. Now no power Δ^m is contained in J either. Because J is itself a d -ideal, there is no loss in assuming that $I = J$. Then $x \in \mathcal{M}, \Delta x \in I \Rightarrow x \in I$, so that (12) holds. By Lemma 2.6 it follows that $I = \mathcal{M}$, in which case the Lemma is clear. $\square$

3 Proof of Theorems 1 and 2

We keep previous notation and assumptions. We separate the main part of the proof of Theorem 1, which is the following.

Theorem 3.1 *$\mathcal{H}(V)$ is a finitely generated $\mathcal{M}$ -module.*

First we show by induction on $\dim V$ that if Theorem 3.1 holds for *irreducible* representations then it holds in general. Indeed, let

$$0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow V \rightarrow W \rightarrow 0$$

be a short exact sequence of Γ -modules with W irreducible. By Lemma 2.5 we have an exact sequence of $\mathcal{M}$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(W).$$

By induction $\mathcal{H}(U)$ is finitely generated. Assuming that $\mathcal{H}(W)$ is finitely generated, $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{H}(U)$ is also finitely generated since it is isomorphic to an $\mathcal{M}$ -submodule of $\mathcal{H}(W)$. Now the finite generation of $\mathcal{H}(V)$ follows.

For the duration of the proof of Theorem 3.1, we assume that V is an *irreducible* Γ -module of dimension p . One consequence of this is that *every* nonzero vector-valued modular form $F(\tau) \in \mathcal{H}(k, V)$ is essential. Fix a nonzero $F(\tau) \in \mathcal{H}(k_0, V)$ (cf. (5)), and introduce the graded $\mathcal{M}$ -submodule

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{G}(k_0 + 2k) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \mathcal{M} d^i F$$

of $\mathcal{H}(V)$. Being linearly independent, the component functions of $F(\tau)$ cannot satisfy a linear differential equation of order *less* than p . This implies that $\mathcal{G}$ is a *direct sum*

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} \mathcal{M} d^i(F), \tag{13}$$

and in particular it is a finitely generated free $\mathcal{M}$ -module. The next result is crucial.

Lemma 3.2 *There is a constant B , depending only on V , such that*

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}(k_0 + 2k)/\mathcal{G}(k_0 + 2k)) \leq B \quad (14)$$

holds for all $k \geq 0$.

Proof: Because the action of d on $\mathcal{H}(k, \rho)$ raises weights by 2, it follows from (13) that

$$\dim \mathcal{G}(k_0 + 2k) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \dim \mathcal{M}_{2k-2i}. \quad (15)$$

It is well-known that $\dim \mathcal{M}_{2k} = [k/6]$ or $[k/6] + 1$ according as $2k$ is, or is not, congruent to 2 (mod 12). Using this, it follows from (15) that there is a constant B' depending only on p , such that

$$|\dim \mathcal{G}(k_0 + 2k) - pk/6| \leq B'.$$

The Lemma follows from this together with Lemma 2.3. $\square$

Consider the tower of $\mathcal{M}$ -modules

$$\mathcal{H}(V) \supseteq \mathcal{T} \supseteq \mathcal{G} \supseteq 0 \quad (16)$$

where

$$\mathcal{T} = \{x \in \mathcal{H}(V) \mid \Delta^r x \in \mathcal{G}, r \geq 0\}. \quad (17)$$

Thus $\mathcal{T}/\mathcal{G}$ is the Δ -torsion submodule of $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{G}$. In order to show that $\mathcal{H}(V)$ is finitely generated, it suffices to show that the $\mathcal{M}$ -modules $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{T}/\mathcal{G}$, and $\mathcal{G}$ are each finitely generated. The finite generation of $\mathcal{G}$ has already been established.

Lemma 3.3 *$\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{T}$ is a finitely generated $\mathcal{M}$ -module.*

Proof: By construction, Δ does not annihilate any nonzero element of the quotient module in question. We assert that $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{T}$ is a *torsion-free* $\mathbb{C}[\Delta]$ -module. If not, using the fundamental theorem of algebra we can find a nonzero homogeneous element $x \in \mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{T}$ and a scalar λ such that $\Delta + \lambda$ annihilates x . Because the action of Δ raises weights by 12, this forces $\lambda = 0$, so that Δ annihilates x , a contradiction.

Now suppose that the Lemma is false. Then for any integer n we can find a finitely generated graded $\mathcal{M}$ -submodule of $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{T}$ generated by no fewer than n elements, and therefore also a finitely generated graded $\mathbb{C}[\Delta]$ -submodule $\mathcal{I}_n$, say, generated by no fewer than n elements. As a finitely generated torsion-free $\mathbb{C}[\Delta]$ -module, $\mathcal{I}_n$ is necessarily free because $\mathbb{C}[\Delta]$ is a principal ideal domain. Thus we have shown that $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{T}$ contains finitely generated graded free $\mathbb{C}[\Delta]$ -modules of arbitrarily large rank. It is easy to see that this is not consistent with the boundedness of the grading on $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{T}$ established in Lemma 3.2, which contradiction completes the proof of the Lemma. $\square$

It remains to prove that $\mathcal{T}/\mathcal{G}$ is a finitely generated $\mathcal{M}$ -module. We prove a bit more than we need, namely

Lemma 3.4 *There is an integer $r \geq 0$ such that $\mathfrak{p}^r \subseteq \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{T}/\mathcal{G})$. Moreover, $\mathcal{T}/\mathcal{G}$ is a finitely generated $\mathcal{M}/\mathfrak{p}^r$ -module.*

Proof: Define a sequence of graded $\mathcal{M}$ -modules $\mathcal{A}_n$, $n = -1, 0, 1, \dots$ as follows. $\mathcal{A}_{-1} = \mathcal{G}\Delta$, and for $n \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{A}_n/\mathcal{G} = \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{T}/\mathcal{G}}(\mathfrak{p}^n).$$

Then

$$\mathcal{A}_{-1} \subseteq \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{A}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \dots \quad (18)$$

is an ascending sequence of $\mathcal{M}$ -modules such that each quotient $\mathcal{A}_n/\mathcal{A}_{n-1}$ is annihilated by $\mathfrak{p}$. We assert that $\mathcal{A}_n/\mathcal{A}_{n-1}$, $n \geq 0$, is a finitely generated, torsion-free $\mathcal{M}/\mathfrak{p}$ -module. If $n = 0$ the result holds because $\mathcal{G}$ is a finitely generated, free $\mathcal{M}$ -module. Proceeding by induction on n , consider the morphism

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : \mathcal{A}_{n+1}/\mathcal{A}_n &\rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n/\mathcal{A}_{n-1} \\ a + \mathcal{A}_n &\mapsto \Delta a + \mathcal{A}_{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

of $\mathcal{M}/\mathfrak{p}$ -modules. By construction, φ is an *injection*. By induction, $\mathcal{A}_n/\mathcal{A}_{n-1}$ is a finitely generated, torsion-free $\mathcal{M}/\mathfrak{p}$ -module, hence the same is true for any submodule, and in particular for $\mathcal{A}_{n+1}/\mathcal{A}_n \cong \text{im } \varphi$. This proves our assertion.

From what we have established so far, it follows that every nonzero quotient $\mathcal{A}_{n+1}/\mathcal{A}_n$ contains a graded free $\mathcal{M}/\mathfrak{p}$ -submodule. Lemma 3.2 then implies that the sequence (18) stabilizes. Let $r \geq 0$ be the least integer such that $\mathcal{A}_r = \mathcal{A}_{r+1}$. Since $\mathcal{T}/\mathcal{G}$ is a Δ -torsion module it follows that $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{A}_r$, and this is equivalent to the first assertion of the Lemma. Furthermore, since each $\mathcal{A}_{n+1}/\mathcal{A}_n$ is finitely generated as $\mathcal{M}/\mathfrak{p}$ -module then $\mathcal{T}/\mathcal{G}$ is finitely generated as $\mathcal{M}/\mathfrak{p}^r$ -module. This completes the proof of the Lemma, and with it also the proof of Theorem 3.1. $\square$

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1. In order to show that $\mathcal{H}(V)$ is a free $\mathcal{M}$ -module it suffices (after Theorem 3.1) to establish that $\mathcal{H}(V)$ is *Cohen-Macaulay*. See, for example, Section 4.3 of [B] for further details and facts that we use below. Write $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(V)$. We assert that (Δ, Q) is a *regular sequence* for $\mathcal{H}$. This means that the following two conditions hold:

- (a) $\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{H}}(\Delta) = 0$, $0 \neq \Delta\mathcal{H} \neq \mathcal{H}$,
- (b) $\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{H}/\Delta\mathcal{H}}(Q) = 0$, $0 \neq Q(\mathcal{H}/\Delta\mathcal{H}) \neq \mathcal{H}/\Delta\mathcal{H}$.

These facts follow easily from a consideration of the q -expansions of components of vector-valued modular forms in $\mathcal{H}$. In more detail, (a) holds because $\mathcal{H}$ is torsion-free as $\mathcal{M}$ -module and because multiplication by Δ raises weights by 12. As for (b), notice that $\Delta\mathcal{H}$ consists of those holomorphic vector-valued modular forms $F(\tau) = (f_1(\tau), \dots, f_p(\tau))^t$ such that the coefficient of the leading power q^{m_j} of the q -expansion of $f_j(\tau)$ (cf. (4)) *vanishes*, $1 \leq j \leq p$. On the other hand, multiplication by Q raises weights by 4 and does not change the order of vanishing at ∞ . (b) follows immediately.

Because $\mathcal{M}$ has Krull dimension 2, the existence of the regular sequence (Δ, Q) of length 2 means that $\mathcal{H}$ is indeed Cohen-Macaulay. Then because $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{C}[Q, R]$ is a weighted polynomial algebra, $\mathcal{H}$ is a finitely generated free $\mathcal{M}$ -module.

Finally, we have to show that the rank of $\mathcal{H}$ as $\mathcal{M}$ -module is exactly p . The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.2. Namely, suppose that $F_1, \dots, F_l$ are vector-valued modular forms of weights $k_0 + 2k_1, \dots, k_0 + 2k_l$ respectively and also free generators of $\mathcal{H}$ as $\mathcal{M}$ -module. Then

$$\dim \mathcal{H}(k_0 + 2k, \rho) = \sum_{j=1}^l \dim \mathcal{M}_{2k-2k_j},$$

so that for $k \gg 0$ we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^l [(k - k_j)/6] \leq \dim \mathcal{H}(k_0 + 2k, \rho) \leq \sum_{j=1}^l [(k - k_j)/6] + 1.$$

Thus there is a constant C such that for all k we have

$$|\dim \mathcal{H}(k_0 + 2k, \rho) - lk/6| < C.$$

Comparing this with Lemma 2.3 shows that $l = p$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

We turn to the proof of Theorem 2. Part (a) is included in Lemma 2.5. We restate part (b) as follows:

Lemma 3.5 *Suppose that $i : U \rightarrow V$ is an injective morphism of Γ -modules. Then $\mathcal{H}(U) \xrightarrow{i_*} \mathcal{H}(V)$ is a split injection. That is, $i_*\mathcal{H}(U)$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{H}(V)$ as $\mathcal{M}$ -module.*

Proof: We know from Lemma 2.5 that i_* is an injection. In the following, we identify $\mathcal{H}(U)$ with its i_* -image in $\mathcal{H}(V)$ and U with its i -image in V . First we prove that $\mathcal{H}(U)$ is a *pure* $\mathcal{M}$ -submodule of $\mathcal{H}(V)$, ie., $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{H}(U)$ is *torsion-free*. Suppose that $0 \neq g(\tau) \in \mathcal{M}_{2k}, F(\tau) \in \mathcal{H}(k_1, V)$ and $gF \in \mathcal{H}(U)$. We have to show that $F \in \mathcal{H}(U)$. If $\tau \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$g(\tau)F(\tau) \in U \subseteq V.$$

If $g(\tau) \neq 0$ this implies that $F(\tau) \in U$. Since g is nonzero, the zeros of $g(\tau)$ in $\mathcal{H}$ are *discrete*. Since F is continuous and U closed in V , it follows that $F(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq U$, that is $F \in \mathcal{H}(U)$. This establishes the purity of $\mathcal{H}(U)$.

Let $\mathcal{M}^+$ be the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{M}$ generated by Q and R . From Theorem 1 we know that

$$E = \mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{M}^+\mathcal{H}(V)$$

is a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$ -linear space of dimension p , and that a set $F_1, \dots, F_p$ of p (homogeneous) elements of $\mathcal{H}(V)$ is a set of free generators (as $\mathcal{M}$ -module)

if, and only if, $F_1, \dots, F_p$ maps onto a *basis* of E via the canonical projection $\mathcal{H}(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{M}^+\mathcal{H}(V)$. Because of the purity of $\mathcal{H}(U)$ it is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{M}^+\mathcal{H}(V) \cap \mathcal{H}(U) = \mathcal{M}^+\mathcal{H}(U).$$

Therefore, a second application of Theorem 1 shows that

$$E_0 = (\mathcal{H}(U) + \mathcal{M}^+\mathcal{H}(V))/\mathcal{M}^+\mathcal{H}(V) \cong \mathcal{H}(U)/\mathcal{M}^+\mathcal{H}(U)$$

is a $\mathbb{C}$ -linear subspace of E of dimension $n = \dim U$. Choose homogeneous elements $G_1, \dots, G_n \in \mathcal{H}(U)$ which map onto a basis of E_0 , and extend this set to a basis of E by choosing appropriate homogeneous elements $G_{n+1}, \dots, G_p$ in $\mathcal{H}(V)$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{H}(U) \oplus N$$

where N is the $\mathcal{M}$ -submodule generated by $G_{n+1}, \dots, G_p$. This completes the proof of the Lemma. $\square$

Turning to the proof of Theorem 2(c), set $\mathcal{H}' = j_*\mathcal{H}(V)$. After part (b) we know that there is a direct sum decomposition of $\mathcal{M}$ -modules

$$\mathcal{H}(V) = i_*\mathcal{H}(U) \oplus \mathcal{H}',$$

and by Theorem 1, $\mathcal{H}(V)$ and $\mathcal{H}(U)$ are free of ranks $\dim V$ and $\dim U$ respectively. Then $\mathcal{H}'$ is free of rank $\dim V - \dim U$.

It remains to show that $\mathcal{H}(W)/\mathcal{H}'$, which is a graded $\mathcal{M}$ -module, has finite dimension. In other words, we must show that for all large enough k , $\mathcal{H}(k, W) \subseteq \mathcal{H}'$. Let us assume, as we may, that V furnishes a representation ρ of Γ which is *upper triangular*. More precisely, for $\gamma \in \Gamma$ set

$$\rho(\gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(\gamma) & \beta(\gamma) \\ 0 & \sigma(\gamma) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Then α and σ are representations of Γ corresponding to the Γ -modules U and $V/U \cong W$ respectively. Suppose that $r = \dim U, s = \dim W$, and that

$$F(\tau) = (f_1(\tau), \dots, f_r(\tau), f_{r+1}(\tau), \dots, f_{r+s}(\tau))^t$$

is an element in $\mathcal{H}(k, V)$ adapted to the choice of basis for which ρ is as in (19). Then $F'(\tau) = (f_r(\tau), f_{r+1}(\tau), \dots, f_{r+s}(\tau))^t$ is an element of $\mathcal{H}(k, W)$ and the morphism $j_* : \mathcal{H}(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(W)$ induced by $j : V \rightarrow W$ is just the map

$$F(\tau) \mapsto F'(\tau). \quad (20)$$

Now the operator D on $\mathcal{H}(V)$ (and $\mathcal{H}(W)$) acts in a componentwise fashion. Then the previous discussion makes it clear that j_* is a *morphism of graded $\mathcal{R}$ -modules*. As a result, $\mathcal{H}'$ and $\mathcal{H}(W)/\mathcal{H}'$ are both graded $\mathcal{R}$ -modules. By Theorem 1, $\mathcal{H}(W)$ is a free $\mathcal{M}$ -module of rank s . Another application of Theorem 1, together with Theorem 2(b), shows that $\mathcal{H}'$ is also a free $\mathcal{M}$ -module of rank s . It follows (cf. the proof of Lemma 3.2) that the grading on $\mathcal{H}(W)/\mathcal{H}'$ has

bounded dimension in the sense that there is an upper bound on the dimension of the homogeneous subspaces.

Consider $\mathcal{H}(W)/\mathcal{H}'$ as $\mathcal{M}$ -module. Because it is finitely generated, the boundedness of the dimensions of the homogeneous subspaces implies that the annihilator $\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{H}(W)/\mathcal{H}')$ is a *nonzero* ideal, call it J . Moreover, because $\mathcal{H}(W)/\mathcal{H}'$ is a graded $\mathcal{R}$ -module then J is a graded d -ideal in the sense of Lemma 2.6. By Lemma 2.7 we conclude that there is an integer t such that

$$J \supseteq \mathfrak{p}^t. \quad (21)$$

We will prove the following assertion:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{for all large enough } k, \text{ the homogeneous subspace} \\ &(\mathcal{H}(W)/\mathcal{H}')_k \text{ of weight } k \text{ contains no nonzero } \Delta\text{-torsion.} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

If this is so, it is consistent with (21) only if $(\mathcal{H}(W)/\mathcal{H}')_k = 0$ for large enough k . This is equivalent to the containment $\mathcal{H}(k, W) \subseteq \mathcal{H}'$, which is what we seek to prove. Therefore, the proof of Theorem 2(c) is reduced to establishing (22).

Suppose that $G(\tau) \in \mathcal{H}(k, W)$ satisfies $\Delta G \in \mathcal{H}'$. From our discussion of (20), this means that there is $F \in \mathcal{H}(k+12, V)$ with

$$F(\tau) = (f_1(\tau), \dots, f_r(\tau), \Delta(\tau)G(\tau))^t.$$

We now apply Lemma 2.1. It tells us that for large enough k , we can always find $H(\tau) = (h_1(\tau), \dots, h_r(\tau))^t \in \mathcal{H}(k+12, U)$ such that the leading term of $h_j(\tau)$ coincides with that of $f_j(\tau)$ for $1 \leq j \leq r$. Now consider the vector-valued modular form

$$F^0(\tau) = F(\tau) - (H(\tau), \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_s)^t.$$

By construction we have $\Delta^{-1}F^0(\tau) \in \mathcal{H}(k, V)$. Moreover,

$$j_*(\Delta^{-1}F^0(\tau)) = \Delta^{-1}j_*(F(\tau)) = G(\tau),$$

so that in fact $G(\tau) \in \mathcal{H}'$. This proves that (22) holds for all large enough k , and the proof of Theorem 2(c) is complete. $\square$

4 Proof of Theorems 3 and 4

For the first two results, we fix an *essential* vector-valued modular form $F \in \mathcal{H}(k_1, V)$. In this context we continue to use the notation of the previous Section. In particular, we set

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} \mathcal{M}d^i F.$$

Because F is essential the last display is indeed, as in (13), a direct sum of $\mathcal{M}$ -modules. The argument is the same as before. We also have the corresponding tower of $\mathcal{M}$ -modules (16) with $\mathcal{T}$ as in (17). Introduce

$$\mathcal{G}' = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{M} d^i F.$$

$\mathcal{G}'$ is the cyclic $\mathcal{R}$ -submodule of $\mathcal{H}(V)$ generated by F . Of course it contains $\mathcal{G}$, and generally the containment is *proper*.

Lemma 4.1 *The $\mathcal{M}$ -module $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{G}'$ is a Δ -torsion module, i.e., it is annihilated by some power of Δ .*

Proof: The proof is similar to a part of the argument used in the proof of Theorem 2(c). Briefly, it goes as follows. Arguing as in Lemma 3.2 we find that the homogeneous spaces of $\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{G}'$ are of bounded dimension. Because of finite generation, it follows that the annihilator $I = \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{G}')$ is nonzero. Because $\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{G}'$ is an $\mathcal{R}$ -module then I is a nonzero d -ideal of $\mathcal{M}$. By Lemma 2.7 it follows that $\mathfrak{p}^r \subseteq I$ for some $r \geq 1$, as required. $\square$

Lemma 4.2 *Suppose that $F = (f_1, \dots, f_p)^t$ and that the component functions f_j have q -expansions*

$$f_j(\tau) = c_j q^{\lambda_j} + \dots, \quad c_j \neq 0, \quad 1 \leq j \leq p.$$

Then the following are equivalent:

- (a) $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{G}$,
- (b) $m_j = \lambda_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq p$ and no two of the m_j are equal.

(Here, the m_j are as in (2).)

Proof: We keep the notation used in the preceding proof. We may, and shall, assume that the component functions $f_1(\tau), \dots, f_p(\tau)$ have normalized q -expansions

$$f_j(\tau) = q^{\lambda_j} + \dots, \quad j = 1, \dots, p$$

(recall that $m_j \leq \lambda_j$ and $\lambda_j - m_j \in \mathbb{Z}$), with

$$0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_s < 1 \leq \lambda_{s+1} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_p. \quad (23)$$

Let $F' \in \mathcal{G}$ be a vector-valued modular form of weight $k_1 + 2k$, with

$$\begin{aligned} F' &= \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} g_i d^i F, \quad g_i \in \mathcal{M}_{2k-2i}, \\ g_i &= a_i + O(q), \quad a_i \in \mathbb{C}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq p-1. \end{aligned}$$

Because the $d^i F$, $0 \leq i \leq p-1$, are linearly independent over $\mathcal{M}$, it follows that $\mathcal{T} \neq \mathcal{G}$ if, and only if, it is possible to choose a_i 's not all equal to 0 in such

a way that the component functions of F' nevertheless all vanish to order at least 1 at ∞ .

The vector consisting of leading coefficients of the components of F' is equal to Av^t where $v = (a_0, \dots, a_{p-1})$ and A is the $p \times p$ matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda_1 - 1/12 & \dots \\ 1 & \lambda_2 - 1/12 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \\ 1 & \lambda_p - 1/12 & \dots \end{pmatrix}.$$

We easily see that A is similar to the Vandermonde matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda_1 & \dots & \lambda_1^{p-1} \\ 1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_2^{p-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 1 & \lambda_p & \dots & \lambda_p^{p-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

and in particular, A is invertible if, and only if, all of the λ_i 's are *distinct*.

Write A in block form

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} U & V \\ W & X \end{pmatrix}$$

where U is an $s \times s$ matrix and s is as in (23). In order to be able to choose the vector v of a_i 's so that the components of $\sum g_i d^i F$ vanish to order at least 1 at ∞ , it is necessary and sufficient to solve the system of equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} U & V \\ W & X \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ * \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

Here, $v^t = (v_1, v_2)^t$ and $*$ is arbitrary. This is because the 'lower piece' of v^t corresponds to those $\lambda_j \geq 1$ and no condition is imposed on the corresponding coefficients.

Now suppose that (b) of Theorem 4.2 holds. Then A is invertible, $s = p$, and the only way to solve (24) is with $v = 0$. So $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{G}$ in this case and (a) holds.

Suppose that the λ_j 's are *not* distinct. Then A is singular, and we may take v to be any nonzero vector annihilated by A . So in this case (a) does not hold. On the other hand, if the λ_j 's are distinct but not all less than 1 (i.e. $s < p$), then we may choose $*$ in (24) to be nonzero and take $v^t = A^{-1}(0, *)^t \neq 0$. So (a) does not hold in this case either. This shows that if (b) is false then so is (a), and the proof of the Lemma is complete. $\square$

We now prove Theorem 3. Suppose first that $\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{R}F$ is a cyclic $\mathcal{R}$ -module with generator F . In our earlier notation, we have $\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{G}'$. Let the components of F be as in Lemma 4.2. Note that F is necessarily an essential vector-valued modular form. Let the weight of F be k_0 .

We claim that $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}'$. We argue as follows. By Theorem 1, $\mathcal{H}(V)$ has an $\mathcal{M}$ -basis of cardinality p . Because $\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{R}F$, up to scalars F is the unique nonzero vector-valued modular form in $\mathcal{H}(V)$ of least weight. Thus, we may choose F to be a member of a basis of $\mathcal{H}(V)$. Let r be the maximal integer such that $F, dF, \dots, d^r F$ is part of a basis, with

$$N = \sum_{i=0}^r \mathcal{M} d^i F$$

the $\mathcal{M}$ -submodule of $\mathcal{H}(V)$ spanned by these elements. Thus $0 \leq r \leq p-1$, and we want to show that $r = p-1$. If $d^{r+1}F \in N$ then there is a linear relation

$$d^{r+1}F = \sum_{j=1}^r g_j d^j F, \quad g_j \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Since F is essential, such a relation implies that $r+1 \geq p$ and we are done. If $d^{r+1}F \notin N$ then $d^{r+1}F + N$ is, up to scalars, the unique nonzero element of least weight in the free $\mathcal{M}$ -module $\mathcal{H}(V)/N$. Then (up to scalars) $d^{r+1}F + N$ is necessarily a member of any $\mathcal{M}$ -basis of $\mathcal{H}(V)/N$, in which case $F, dF, \dots, d^{r+1}F$ is part of a basis of $\mathcal{H}(V)$. This contradicts the definition of r , and proves our claim.

Having established that $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}'$, it follows that

$$\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{G}.$$

In particular, we have $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{G}$, so that Lemma 4.2 is applicable and we can conclude that (b) of Lemma 4.2 holds. Furthermore, since $d^p F \in \mathcal{G}$ there is a relation

$$d^p F + \sum_{j=2}^{p-1} g_j d^j F, \quad g_j \in \mathcal{M}_{2p-2j}.$$

This defines a MLDE $L_{k_0}[f] = 0$ where L is the differential operator

$$L = D^p + \sum_{j=2}^{p-1} g_j D^j.$$

The roots of the corresponding indicial equation are the λ_j . As we have seen, these coincide with the m_j , and are distinct. That the weight k_0 is determined by (9) is proved in [M1]. We have now established all of the conditions stated in Theorem 3 under the assumption that $\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{R}F$.

As for the converse, suppose that we have a MLDE satisfying the conditions of Theorem 3. The solution space V defines an element $F \in \mathcal{H}(k_0, V)$ (cf. [M1]), and since the roots of the indicial equation are real and distinct then the monodromy matrix $\rho(T)$ is unitarizable. (Here, V affords the representation ρ of Γ .)

Let $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}'$ have the same meaning as before, where now F is determined by the MLDE as in the previous paragraph. Thus in fact $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}'$, and we have to

show that $\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{G}'$. To see this, note that in the present situation part (b) of Lemma 4.2 holds. That result then shows that $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{G}$, i.e., $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{G}$ contains no nonzero Δ -torsion. On the other hand, $\mathcal{H}(V)/\mathcal{G}'$ is a Δ -torsion module by Lemma 4.1. Since $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}'$, the only way to reconcile these statements is the conclusion that $\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{G}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3. $\square$

Finally, we consider Theorem 4. If V is not indecomposable it is a direct sum of two 1-dimensional Γ -modules, so we start with the 1-dimensional case. Of course this is well-known, but it is interesting nonetheless to reconsider it from our current perspective. In this case $\mathcal{H}(V)$ is a free $\mathcal{M}$ -module of rank 1. Thus if F_0 is a nonzero vector-valued modular form of minimal weight k_0 then

$$\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{M}F_0 = \mathbb{C}F_0 \oplus \mathbb{C}QF_0 \oplus \dots$$

Since there are no nonzero vector-valued forms of weight $k_0 + 2$ then $DF_0 = 0$. Since $F_0 = (f_0)$ where $f_0(\tau)$ is a classical modular form of weight k_0 , the condition $Df_0 = 0$ implies that f_0 is a scalar multiple of $\eta(\tau)^{2k_0} = q^{k_0/12} + \dots$. If $k_0 \geq 12$ then $\Delta^{-1}F_0$ is a nonzero vector-valued form of weight *less* than k_0 , a contradiction. Thus $0 \leq k_0 \leq 11$, and we arrive at the 12 possibilities

$$\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{M}\eta(\tau)^{2k_0}, \quad 0 \leq k_0 \leq 11$$

corresponding to the various 1-dimensional representations χ^{k_0} of Γ .

We turn to the case that V is indecomposable but not irreducible. It will be useful to record some facts about these modules, which are more-or-less proved in [M2], Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 4.3 *Suppose that V is a 2-dimensional indecomposable module which is not irreducible and furnishes a representation ρ of Γ . Then there is an ordered pair of 12th roots of unity (μ_1, μ_2) such that μ_1/μ_2 is a primitive sixth root of unity and such that $\rho(T)$ is similar to the diagonal matrix*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The representation ρ is characterized up to equivalence by (μ_1, μ_2) . Thus there are just 24 equivalence classes of such representations. $\square$

In what follows we take V with $\rho(T)$ diagonal as in the last Lemma. We may, and shall, assume that ρ is *upper triangular*. Let $F_0 \in \mathcal{H}(V)$ be a nonzero vector-valued modular form of least weight k_0 , say, and set $F_0 = (f_1(\tau), f_2(\tau))^t$. We first consider the case

$$DF_0 = 0, \tag{25}$$

and assume this until further notice. Then $Df_1 = Df_2 = 0$, and since f_1, f_2 are both solutions of the same differential equation they can differ only by an overall scalar. If they are both *nonzero* then they have q -expansions $f_j(\tau) = c_j q^t + \dots$ with nonzero scalars c_j , and from this it follows that $\rho(T)$ is a *scalar matrix*.

Because ρ is indecomposable this is not possible, and we conclude that one of the components of F_0 vanishes identically. Because ρ is upper triangular then $f_2 = 0$. Now $f_1(\tau)$ is a classical modular form of weight k_0 which is annihilated by D . Thus f_1 is a scalar multiple of $\eta(\tau)^{2k_0}$, and we may take

$$F_0 = (\eta(\tau)^{2k_0}, 0)^t.$$

Because F_0 has minimal weight then $\Delta^{-1}F_0$ cannot be holomorphic. It follows that $0 \leq k_0 < 12$.

We know that $\mathcal{H}(V)$ is free of rank 2 as $\mathcal{M}$ -module, and that we may take F_0 as one of the free generators. Let k_1 be the weight of the second free generator $G = (g_1, g_2)^t$, say. Thus $k_0 \leq k_1$. Because DG has weight $k_1 + 2$ and is not a free generator of $\mathcal{H}(V)$ then

$$DG = \alpha F_0 = (\alpha \eta^{2k_0}, 0)^t$$

for some $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{k_1-k_0+2}$. In particular, $Dg_2 = 0$. Because ρ is upper triangular then g_2 is a classical holomorphic modular form, and since it is also annihilated by D then

$$g_2 = u\eta(\tau)^{2k_1}$$

for a scalar u . We claim that $u \neq 0$. Otherwise, because $\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{M}F_0 + \mathcal{M}G$ it follows that the second component of *every* element in $\mathcal{H}(V)$ vanishes, and in particular there is no essential vector-valued modular form. This contradicts Lemma 2.2. So we may choose $u = 1$.

We next assert that $k_1 \geq 1$. If not, $k_0 = k_1 = 0$ and $DG = 0$. But then as before the component functions of G are linearly dependent, and we easily see in this case that ρ is the direct sum of a pair of 1-dimensional representations, contradiction.

We claim also that $k_1 \leq 11$. Otherwise, consider the vector-valued modular form

$$\begin{aligned} H(\tau) &= xE_{k_1-k_0+4}(\tau)F_0 + QG \\ &= xE_{k_1-k_0+4}(\tau) \begin{pmatrix} \eta(\tau)^{2k_0} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + Q \begin{pmatrix} g_1 \\ \eta(\tau)^{2k_1} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}(\rho, k_1 + 4), \end{aligned}$$

$x \in \mathbb{C}$. We can choose x so that both components of $H(\tau)$ vanish to order at least 1 at ∞ , so that $0 \neq \Delta^{-1}H(\tau) \in \mathcal{H}(\rho, k_1-8)$. This forces $\Delta^{-1}H(\tau) \in \mathcal{M}F_0$, in which case $H(\tau) \in \mathcal{M}F_0$, contradiction.

Since $f_1(\tau) = \eta(\tau)^{2k_0}$ and $g_2(\tau) = \eta(\tau)^{2k_1}$ with $0 \leq k_0 \leq k_1 \leq 11$ then $m_1 = k_0/12, m_2 = k_1/12$ (notation as in (2)). By Lemma 4.3 we find that

$$m_2 - m_1 = 1/6 \text{ or } 5/6. \tag{26}$$

There are exactly 12 choices of pairs (m_1, m_2) satisfying (26) together with $0 \leq m_1, m_2 < 1$. They correspond to half of the indecomposable Γ -modules described in Lemma 4.3.

Now we assume that (25) does *not* hold. Then (up to scalars), the unique pair of homogeneous free generators for $\mathcal{H}(V)$ as $\mathcal{M}$ -module consists of F_0 and DF_0 . Thus in this case $\mathcal{H}(V) = \mathcal{R}F_0$, and Theorem 3 applies. Thus we know that we may take

$$F_0(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} f_1(\tau) \\ f_2(\tau) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} q^{m_1} + \dots \\ q^{m_2} + \dots \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$k_0 = 6(m_1 + m_2) - 1.$$

Because ρ is *upper triangular*, $f_2(\tau)$ is a nonzero classical holomorphic modular form of weight k_0 and $f_2(\tau) = \eta(\tau)^{24m_2}\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{k_0-12m_2}$. Then

$$0 \leq k_0 - 12m_2 = 6(m_1 - m_2) - 1 < 5,$$

and since $k_0 - 12m_2$ is the weight of α then it must be 0 or 4. Therefore,

$$m_1 - m_2 = 1/6 \text{ or } 5/6. \quad (27)$$

There are exactly 12 ordered pairs (m_1, m_2) satisfying (27) together with $0 \leq m_2 < m_1 < 1$. Notice that these correspond, as they must, to the 12 classes of indecomposables *not* covered by (26).

Let us consider the Hilbert-Poincaré series of $\mathcal{H}(V)$. By Theorem 2 there is a containment of $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded $\mathcal{M}$ -modules

$$\mathcal{H}(V) \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\chi^a) \oplus \mathcal{H}(\chi^b). \quad (28)$$

Here, notation is as in the statement of Theorem 4.

Consider first the case that (25) holds. Here we showed above that the two fundamental weights are $k_0 = 12m_1$ and $k_1 = 12m_2$. It follows that, in the notation of (28), we have $a = k_0$ and $b = k_1$. Then both $\mathcal{H}(V)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\chi^a) \oplus \mathcal{H}(\chi^b)$ have the *same* Hilbert-Poincaré series

$$\frac{t^a + t^b}{(1 - t^4)(1 - t^6)}, \quad (29)$$

and in particular (28) is an *equality* in this case.

Now assume that (25) does *not* hold. We saw that an $\mathcal{M}$ -basis of $\mathcal{H}(V)$ has the form F_0, DF_0 , so that

$$PS \mathcal{H}(V) = \frac{t^{k_0}(1 + t^2)}{(1 - t^4)(1 - t^6)}$$

with $k_0 = 6(m_1 + m_2) - 1$. Suppose first that $k_0 = 12m_2$, so that $m_1 - m_2 = 1/6$. In this case, $f_2 = \eta(\tau)^{24m_2}$ has weight k_0 and corresponds to the character χ^b . Thus $b = 12m_2 = k_0$ and $a = 12m_1 = 12m_2 + 2 = k_0 + 2$. So in this case, the

Poincaré series of $\mathcal{H}(V)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\chi^a) \oplus \mathcal{H}(\chi^b)$ again coincide with (29) and (28) is an equality.

In the remaining case, when $k_0 = 12m_2 + 4$ and $m_1 - m_2 = 5/6$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& PS(\mathcal{H}(\chi^a) \oplus \mathcal{H}(\chi^b)) - PS \mathcal{H}(V) \\
= & \frac{t^{12m_1} + t^{12m_2}}{(1-t^4)(1-t^6)} - \frac{t^{k_0}(1+t^2)}{(1-t^4)(1-t^6)} \\
= & \frac{t^{12m_2}(1+t^{10}-t^4-t^6)}{(1-t^4)(1-t^6)} \\
= & t^{12m_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus in this case, the containment (28) is proper and the codimension exactly 1, occuring in weight $b = 12m_2$. The statement of Theorem 4 in the Introduction is just a reorganization of these calculations.

References

- [B] Benson, D., Polynomial Invariants of Finite Groups, Lond. Math. Soc. Lec. Notes **190**, CUP. Cambs. 1993.
- [BG1] Bantay, P., and Gannon, T., Vector-valued modular functions for the modular group and the hypergeometric equation, Comm. Numb Th. and Phys. **1** No. 4 (2007), 651-680.
- [BG2] Bantay, P., and Gannon, T., to appear.
- [DLM] Dong, C., Li, H., and Mason, G., Modular-invariance of Trace Functions in Orbifold Theory and Generalized Moonshine, Comm. Math. Phys. **214** (2000), 1-56.
- [ES] Eholzer, W. and Skoruppa, N-P., Modular-invariance and uniqueness of conformal characters, Comm. Math. Phys. **174** No. 1 (1995), 117-136.
- [KL] Kurth, C. and Long, L., On modular forms for some noncongruence subgroups of $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$, J. Numb. Th. **128** No.7 (2008), 1989-2009.
- [KM1] Knopp, M. and Mason, G., Vector-valued modular forms and Poincaré series, Ill. J. Math. **48**, No. 4 (2003), 1345-1366.
- [KM2] Knopp, M. and Mason, G., On vector-valued modular forms and their Fourier coefficients, Acta Arith. **110** (2003), 117-124.
- [KM3] Knopp, M. and Mason, G., Generalized modular forms, J. Number Th. **99** (2003), 1-28.
- [KoM] Kohnen, W. and Mason, G., On generalized modular forms and their application, Nagoya J. Math. **192** (2008), 119-136.
- [M1] Mason, G., Vector-valued modular forms and linear differential equations, Int. J. No. Th. **3** No. 3 (2007), 1-14.
- [M2] Mason, G., 2-dimensional vector-valued modular forms, Ramanujan J. **17** (2008), 405-427.

- [Ma] Marks, C., Ph.D thesis, UC Santa Cruz, 2009.
- [My] Miyamoto, M., Modular invariance of vertex operator algebras satisfying C_2 -cofiniteness, Duke Math. J. **122** No. 1 (2004), 51-91.
- [Z] Zhu, Y. Modular-invariance of characters of vertex operator algebras, J.A.M.S. **9** (1996), 237-302.

Author's address

Department of Mathematics, University of California at Santa Cruz CA 95064
 cem@ucsc.edu
 gem@cats.ucsc.edu